

Remarks

As noted in the Interview Summary record, the Examiner suggested adding limitations to the instant claims to better distinguish the invention over the prior art. It is believed that the amended version of Claim 1, appended hereto, incorporates the substance of those suggestions. Moreover, in view of the fact that the strip of material comprising the bow member does not have opposite ends that are, as such, discrete from the body of the device (as seen from the several figures of the drawings), Claim 1 has been amended to refer to opposite end portions.

Applicant understands from the interview that the Examiner regards the springs 30, mounted on the projections 29 of the fingers 26 in the guide of the Graham patent, to constitute "attachments." Calling for the opposite end portions of the strip of material to be *fixedly* attached therefore emphasizes the clear, fundamental, and functionally important differences that exist between the claimed tension board and the Graham device. According to the first definition in our *Webster's* dictionary, fixed is used in the sense of "fastened, attached, or placed so as to be firm and not readily movable."

Similarly, characterizing the mutually spaced points of strip attachment as being "different points" emphasizes the clear, fundamental, and functionally important distinctions that exist in the claimed tension board over the guide of Jones. Obviously, the end portions of the loops of which the Jones device is comprised are attached only at the same points.

Claim 1 has been further amended to emphasize that the strip of material projects "from said different points" on the edge of the body, to provide the deformable bow member. Clearly, neither Graham nor Jones provides such a bow member.

During the interview, Applicant's attorney pointed out that the tension gauge incorporated into the present device is described, at page 4, lines 24 and 25 of the specification, to comprise tab 34, which tab is depicted in all figures except Figure 2. This observation is made in response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings on grounds the "tension gauge element," recited in Claims 10-12, is not shown, and should obviate the objection.

In a telephone interview held on February 4, 2005, the Examiner acknowledged that the amended claims presented herein do distinguish over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all claims of the application define an invention that is novel and nonobvious over the prior art.

As he is obliged to do, Applicant hereby affirms his election of Claims 1-6, 9-14 and 17, designated Species I by the Examiner. Applicant also requests however consideration of the withdrawn claims, in view of the evident allowability of generic Claim 1.

All outstanding issues having been addressed and resolved, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. Applicant should like to express appreciation for the Examiner's assistance in prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,
MARCEL CODERRE

By 

Ira S. Dorman
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 24,469
Tel. (860) 528-0772



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I, IRA S. DORMAN, hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed as set forth on the first page hereof, on February 7, 2005.

A handwritten signature, likely of Ira S. Dorman, written over a horizontal line.